



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/826,786	04/05/2001	Patrick Montoya	10954-003	4084

7590 01/26/2007
Douglas L. Wathen, Esq.
GIFFPRD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CITKOWS
P. O. BOX 7021
TROY, MI 48007-7021

EXAMINER

LOFTIS, JOHNNA RONEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3623

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/826,786

Applicant(s)

MONTROYA, PATRICK

Examiner

Johnna R. Loftis

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9,10 and 12-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9,10 and 12-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a final office action upon examination of application number 09/826,786. Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-31 are pending and have been examined on the merits discussed below.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 9, 10 and 12-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
3. Previous rejections of claims 1 and 17 under 35 USC 112, have been withdrawn in response to claim amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Matyas, US 6,102,287, in view of West et al, US 6,175,833.

As per claim 1, Matyas teaches establishing communication between a client and a survey collector having previously collected survey results (column 19, lines 4-15 – buyer requests URL for HTML page from evaluator); receiving by the survey collector a request from

Art Unit: 3623

the client for the previously collected survey results (column 19, lines 4-15 – the buyer clicks on the hyper-link to request product evaluation information); providing the client with a survey questionnaire from the survey collector (column 19, lines 37-60 – the buyer clicks on the survey link to receive the survey questionnaire over the internet); receiving by the survey collector from the client a survey response to the survey questionnaire (column 19, lines 55-60 – the buyer answers the questions in the survey questionnaire); but does not explicitly teach providing access to the previously collected survey results to the client only if the survey collector receives a response to the survey questionnaire from the client; and rejecting the client's request for the survey results if a response to the survey questionnaire is not received from the client. West et al teaches presenting survey results to a reader only after the reader has submitted a vote in the survey. Inherently in West et al's system, if the reader does not submit a vote, survey results are not presented. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify Matyas so that survey results are only presented once a user inputs survey opinion as a way to build a database of survey results. This would ensure the database is updated with new opinions as each reader/customer requests survey results.

As per claim 2, Matyas teaches establishing communication is done via the Internet (figure 8 and column 18, lines 36-41).

As per claim 3, Matyas teaches relating the survey questionnaire by subject matter to the previously collected survey results (column 19, lines 4-54 – the survey questionnaires along with the collected survey results are all related in that they are all directed to product evaluation).

As per claim 4, Matyas teaches the request for previously collected survey results and the survey questionnaire are related to automotive vehicles (column 19, lines 4-60 – the buyer clicks

Art Unit: 3623

on a product of interest; a buyer requests a survey that permits the buyer to fill in the survey questionnaire for the purchased product, which inherently could be any purchased product including an automotive vehicle).

As per claim 5, Matyas teaches providing the client with the survey questionnaire includes requesting the identifying indicia from the client (column 15, lines 54-67 and column 16, lines 1-50 – verification that the product was purchased takes place to ensure responses originate from buyer).

As per claim 6, Matyas teaches identifying indicia (column 3, lines 25-35 – the buyer generates and authentication code to include with the survey information; the evaluator verifies the purchase transaction using the authentication code), but does not explicitly teach the indicia is a product identification number. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to correlate the authentication code of Matyas to the actual product by including the product identification number as the authentication code for purposes of verifying the purchase of the product.

As per claim 7, Matyas teaches identifying indicia (column 3, lines 25-35 – the buyer generates and authentication code to include with the survey information; the evaluator verifies the purchase transaction using the authentication code), but does not explicitly teach the indicia is a VIN number. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to correlate the authentication code of Matyas to the actual product or vehicle purchased by including the VIN number as the authentication code for purposes of verifying the purchase of the vehicle.

As per claim 9, Matyas teaches receiving by the survey collector identifying indicia from the client (column 17, lines 1-29 – buyer identification is received); and correlating the

Art Unit: 3623

identifying indicia with a database to determine if a relationship exists between the identifying indicia and the subject matter of the survey questionnaire (column 17, lines 1-29 – an OK/fail code is generated which indicates whether the buyer with the specific identification purchased a specific product whose name or identifier is given by ID_Product).

As per claim 10, Matyas teaches receiving by the survey collector identifying indicia from the client (column 17, lines 1-29 – buyer identification is received); and correlating the identifying indicia with a database to determine determining if a relationship exists between the identifying indicia and the client (column 17, lines 1-29 – an OK/fail code is generated which indicates whether the buyer with the specific identification purchased a specific product whose name or identifier is given by ID_Product).

As per claim 12, Matyas teaches the previously collected survey results include a composite survey response (column 19, lines 4-15 – collected survey results include survey responses for many products).

As per claim 13, Matyas teaches the composite survey response is unrelated to the survey questionnaire (column 19, lines 4-15 – collected survey results include survey responses for many products – inherently the requested survey results are unrelated to the survey questionnaire if the user submits survey questionnaire for one product, but requests survey results for another product).

As per claim 14, Matyas teaches the composite survey response is generally related to the survey questionnaire (column 19, lines 4-15 – collected survey results include survey responses for many products – inherently the requested survey results are generally related to the survey

Art Unit: 3623

questionnaire if the user submits survey questionnaire for one product, and requests survey results for another closely related product).

As per claim 15, Matyas teaches the client is denied access to the previously collected survey results if no relationship is found between the indicia and the client (column 8, lines 50-67 – registration is needed to access the system, if registration is denied, one cannot access survey results or anything associated with the system).

As per claim 16, Matyas teaches assimilating the survey response into a composite survey response (column 19, lines 29-54 – each survey response is received by the system and stored as a response).

As per claim 17, Matyas teaches a survey questionnaire system which electronically forwards a survey questionnaire on a product to a requesting client (column 19, lines 37-60 – the buyer clicks on the survey link to receive the survey questionnaire over the internet); a product ownership verification system which uses information provided by the client to determine ownership by the client of the product which is the subject of the survey questionnaire (column 3, lines 25-35 – the buyer generates an authentication code to include with the survey information; the evaluator verifies the purchase transaction using the authentication code); but does not explicitly teach providing access to the previously collected survey results to the client only if the survey collector receives a response to the survey questionnaire from the client; and rejecting the client's request for the survey results if a response to the survey questionnaire is not received from the client. West et al teaches presenting survey results to a reader only after the reader has submitted a vote in the survey. Inherently in West et al's system, if the reader does not submit a vote, survey results are not presented. It would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 3623

ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify Matyas so that survey results are only presented once a user inputs survey opinion as a way to build a database of survey results. This would ensure the database is updated with new opinions as each reader/customer requests survey results.

As per claim 18, Matyas teaches verification utilizes a database to correlate the information provided by the client with ownership of the product by the client (column 3, lines 25-35 – the buyer generates and authentication code to include with the survey information; the evaluator verifies the purchase transaction using the authentication code)

As per claim 19, Matyas teaches the verification system utilizes a database publicly accessible via the internet (column 16, lines 46-67 – an internet access provider is used to verify purchase).

As per claim 20, Matyas teaches the verification system utilizes a subscription based database accessible via the internet (column 16, lines 46-67 – an internet access provider is used to verify purchase – inherently subscription based since all internet access is paid for).

As per claim 21, Matyas teaches identifying indicia (column 3, lines 25-35 – the buyer generates and authentication code to include with the survey information; the evaluator verifies the purchase transaction using the authentication code), but does not explicitly teach the indicia is a VIN number. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to correlate the authentication code of Matyas to the actual product or vehicle purchased by including the VIN number as the authentication code for purposes of verifying the purchase of the vehicle.

As per claim 22, Matyas teaches the verification system grants access to the survey results system upon verifying ownership of the product by the client (column 19, lines 4-15 – the

Art Unit: 3623

buyer clicks on the hyper-link to request product evaluation information – inherently only survey information that has previously gone through the ownership verification system is forwarded).

As per claim 23, Matyas teaches the verification system denies access to the survey results system upon inability to verify ownership of the product by the client (column 19, lines 4-15 – the buyer clicks on the hyper-link to request product evaluation information – inherently only survey information that has previously gone through the ownership verification system is forwarded

As per claim 24, Matyas does not explicitly teach a client entered into a drawing upon completion of a survey questionnaire. However it is old and well known in the art of surveys and incentives to enter a person into a prize drawing after completion of a survey as a way to entice people to complete surveys. By offering to enter a person in a prize drawing the distributor of the survey can increase the number of people who fill out the survey.

As per claim 25, Matyas does not explicitly teach one of a monetary payoff of a loan taken out by the client to purchase the product; a monetary payoff of a specified number of loan or lease payments by the client to acquire the product; and a fixed monetary amount. However it is old and well known in the art of surveys and incentives to offer a monetary award to those who complete a survey. By offering to enter a person in a drawing for a monetary award, the distributor of the survey can increase the number of people who fill out the survey.

As per claim 26, Matyas teaches the survey questionnaire system includes software adapted to forward a survey questionnaire to be completed and electronically returned to the survey questionnaire system (column 3, lines 60-64 – software implementation of the survey

Art Unit: 3623

process; column 19, lines 37-60 – the buyer clicks on the survey link to receive the survey questionnaire over the internet).

As per claim 27, Matyas teaches updating a survey answers database upon completion and return of the survey questionnaire by the client (column 22, line 49 – column 23, line 2 – the product evaluation information is updated upon receiving additional survey responses).

As per claim 28, Matyas teaches a client registration system including software which manages data regarding clients previously utilizing the sytem and including a registered member database (column 10, lines 43-53 – a buyer can use the system only after registration wherein they buyer can then continue to use the system using the registration information).

As per claim 29, Matyas teaches the survey questionnaire relates to product. An automotive vehicle is inherently included since a vehicle is a product that is purchased.

As per claim 30, Matyas teaches the requested survey results relates to products (column 19, lines 4-15 – the buyer can request to view product evaluation information compiled from other survey responses). An automotive vehicle is inherently included since a vehicle is a product that is purchased.

As per claim 31, Matyas teaches receiving by the survey collector identifying indicia from the client (column 3, lines 25-35; column 17, lines 1-35); correlating the identifying indicia with a database to determine if the client is a registered member (column 17, lines 1-29); and providing access to the previously collected survey results only if the client is also a registered member (column 10, lines 43-52 – one can only use the system after registering his public key).

Conclusion

Art Unit: 3623

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johnna R. Loftis whose telephone number is 571-272-6736. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 571-272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JL
1/18/07



C. Michelle Taras
C. Michelle Taras
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3623